

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated February 5, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on May 7, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 11-15, 17 and 20-27 are pending in the application. Claims 11-15, 17 and 20-27 remain pending following entry of this response. Claim 13 has been amended for clarification. Applicant submits that the amendment does not introduce new matter.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-12, 20-25, 27 are allowed. Applicant respectfully acknowledges the allowable subject matter. Also, as described below, Applicant submits that the remaining rejected claims are also allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 13-15, 17 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner states that the term "interface circuitry" is not supported in the specification. The Examiner further states that the Applicant is required to show a definition of interface circuitry in the specification.

With respect to the Examiner's statement that a "definition" in the specification is required, Applicant submits that the written description requirement does not require an explicit definition per se. The legal standard of the written description requirement is whether the disclosure of the application reasonably conveys to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention at the time of filing. *University of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.* 358 F.3d 916 (Fed. Cir. 2004). The Federal Circuit law is clear that the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112

does not require word for word support, or even textual support at all, in the specification. *Koito Mfg. Co. v. Turn-Key Tech LLC*, 381 F.3d 1142 (Fed. Cir. 2004). In *Koito* the Federal Circuit found adequate support in a drawing of the specification. (*Id.*)

In the present case, Applicant has amended claims 13-15, 17 and 26 for clarification. The claims, as amended, describe “pins configured to receive the plurality of bits from a memory controller and to transfer the plurality of bits to the row state circuitry.” Applicant submits that the claimed subject matter is described at least in part at Page 11, Paragraph [0042] of the specification and in Figure 6A of the specification. Paragraph [0042], describing Figure 6A, states that a memory controller may transfer the row state information from the memory controller individual memory devices 604. Figure 6A also indicates that row state information (ST-RAM) is transferred, for example, through DQ pins. As depicted in Figure 6A and indicated in the cited passage, the row state information is transferred to the row state circuitry (ST-RAM). Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 13-15, 17 and 26 satisfy the written description requirement. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/

Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant